

# CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST TWENTY-SECOND ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.

VOL. XVIII, No. 2

## BULLETIN

FEBRUARY, 1939

Social Science

HY  
241  
A21  
C18  
V.18

### An Experiment in Interpretation to Young People

LOUISE DRURY

Executive Secretary, Children's Protective Association, Los Angeles, California

OUR "Children's Service to Children" was started ten years ago and has developed from an interesting experiment into a vital avenue of interpretation and, incidentally, into a growing financial resource. We believed that the keen interest of early-teen-age children in "clubs" and their natural desire to help others could be utilized in spreading an understanding of constructive social work with children. It started by interesting the student charity board of one of our city's exclusive private schools in a little girl whose unhappy experiences had left her so insecure and frightened that she had worn out several of our foster boarding mothers with her shrieks of terror at night. The girls of the school paid board for this child for two years, provided her with clothing, and made her happy at Christmas, but more important than the financial help was the opportunity we had each month to tell them of the steps in treatment and invite them to discuss possible ways to overcome her fright. It was a suggestion from them which finally turned the trick—that a dog she adored be allowed to sleep close to her bed so that, when frightened, she could reach out and touch him. Ever since the different departments of this school have maintained an active interest in at least one child. At their own suggestion the resident girls go without dessert one night a week and the money thus saved is spent for milk for specially selected children. This gives us an opportunity to tell the girls about other sorts of problems we encounter. Similar projects have been developed in four or five other private schools, each taking a different type of outlet for service. Each, however, has offered an opening to tell them of our children, giving them an opportunity to discuss real problems, offer suggestions, and, above all, understand the needs of children who come to a social agency for service.

With the opening of our Bluegate Cottage, study and observation home, came our most fruitful opportunity for interpretation, because it is small, tan-

gible, and thus a more easily understood example of our service to selected children. Bluegate Cottage auxiliary groups of girls have sprung up spontaneously, until we now have to limit them to ten groups of twenty children each, because the interpretation program placed too heavy a demand on the time of the professional staff. A new group now comes into the service only as an old group graduates from High School. The members of our first auxiliary group have come back from college and, with others, have organized the "Sponsors," each of whom is responsible for one of the auxiliary groups or special activities at the Cottage. Each group has selected some part of the Cottage or gate for its name—the Hinges, Lanterns, Keys, etc. There are always waiting lists for membership in the auxiliaries and potential groups waiting for the opportunity to affiliate with the organization. Each auxiliary meets monthly and the Director of Case Work or one of the more experienced case workers holds a Junior Case Conference with the girls. At first very simple problems are presented for discussion. Their understanding of how other children feel or may react to certain situations and their suggestions as to what approach may be successful, and their fresh point of view on problems discussed, would be very enlightening to some of our adult Case Conferences. The interpretation does not stop with the children, for on case conference days the case presented is usually taken back to the family dinner tables for further discussion. Many a father and mother has become deeply interested, not only in the Cottage but also in the Association as a whole, through this interest on the part of their children.

The members of the groups know each child who lives at Bluegate Cottage and their interest continues after the child goes out to other types of care. Holidays and birthdays are opportunities for the auxiliary children to have parties, treats, etc., for the children at the Cottage. This personal contact with children

(Continued on page 8)

# Problems Facing Children Who Have Had a Relatively Long Period of Institutional Care

MISS ETHEL VERRY

Executive Secretary, Chicago Orphan Asylum, Chicago, Illinois

(Abstracted from a paper presented at the meeting of the Committee on Social Aspects of Children's Institutions, National Conference of Social Work, Seattle, Washington, June, 1938.)

**T**HE fact that institutional people admit publicly that children for whom they have cared do face special problems when they leave the sheltering arms of the "Home" shows as nothing else could that institutional people can lay claim to the much desired trait, maturity. Institutions no longer need to be on the defensive about their place in the scheme of things. There are plenty of specialists now who agree that the institution does have a place. The advantages of the institution for certain kinds of temporary care, for convalescent care of some children, for the treatment of other children with behavior or personality problems, are admitted and have been listed specifically in a variety of different terms. The opportunity for group experience offered by institution life, the relatively impersonal atmosphere so healing to children torn by parental conflict, the ease of habit training where "we all eat spinach," are but a few of the good things which institutions can offer dependent and neglected children who need those specific experiences.

Might it not be a good thing for us to do some hard thinking about a few of the experiences institutions are not giving children, and so further clarify our minds as to where we can best be of service, and where we should call in the assistance of other agencies? Many institutions are still called upon by the communities in which they are located to give long periods of care, not to special types of children, but rather to the nice, garden variety of homeless youngsters. What are institutions actually doing for these children? Are they doing a good job? If not, could they do a better job by trying or would they really serve better by getting out of the way and thus forcing the community to provide for the children, not in institutions but in some other fashion. Questions such as these still have reality for the majority of institutional people who do a rather long-time job of foster care without having specialized resources.

I present the following suggestions with apologies for taking your time now with material that I hope a few years from now some one will either enlarge upon and prove to be true, or show to have been merely unfounded speculations.

Children who have had a relatively long period of institutional care are usually older children. At least it is the older children whose adjustment back into the community gives us the most active concern. Let us ask then what are the problems that any older child has to meet, and let us see what special difficulties the institutional child may perhaps be expected to encounter in meeting these problems. I have listed the types of adjustments in four main groups for the purposes of discussion, though they do overlap somewhat. First, the problem of economic adjustment or getting money and spending money. Second, the problem of living with our own relatives, not necessarily in the same house, but at least in the same world. We must all adjust to fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters and to our own family group. Third, the problem of creating for ourselves a satisfying social and recreational life, of living somewhere, of having friends, of going places and being somebody; and fourth, the problem of marriage and parenthood and making our own home.

Do children brought up in institutions have a harder time getting jobs than other young people? Just now it would be difficult to find any group of young people who can get jobs easily. Before the depression, the vocational adviser for a large institution told me that he had a hard time placing boys from his institution because they "expected too much." They had been told that "Nothing is too good for the boys from . . . , and the few of their number who had found grand jobs were held up so frequently as an example that the boys as a group had no realization of the sad fact that most of them were of necessity going to have to accept and fill the very ordinary positions that most of the human race do fill. They were not ready to accept that fact and this made it very hard for them to put their best into any ordinary job. As far as giving a child the education that would fit him to hold a job, I see no reason why the institution cannot do as well as anybody else. The real difficulty in the institution as a place where children are prepared to go to work seems to me to lie in the limited amount of information that the children get about the work experiences of others. In a home the father's job, the older children's jobs, the relative's jobs, are constant topics of conversation—what the boss said, what some one did,

## CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA BULLETIN

what was required of workers. So the children grow up in close, informal and realistic contact with the experiences of people working on a job. But in the institution the adults with whom the child is in daily contact do not talk to him about their job, their boss, the conditions of their labor. Of course not. How could they? He is their job, the superintendent is the boss, the conditions of labor are the institution in which he lives. Neither are visiting parents apt to talk much about the trivialities of their jobs to the children, let alone the details of the work of neighbors, relatives and friends. So to the institution children the experience of working is apt to remain a vague and academic thing about which teacher, parent and cottage mother give good advice in general terms which the child is often at a loss to interpret concretely.

In the realm of preparing children to spend money wisely, it seems to me the institution is even more handicapped. Systems of institution money seem to me very artificial and I have yet to see evidence of their worth in training value for the children. A real allowance and a chance to spend it, and make mistakes in so doing, is far better. But even that goes only a little way. The essence of good spending seems to me to lie in making wise choices for ourselves. We learn to choose by making choices, or seeing others make them for us. The important choices are those about real needs. In most households the children do share, if not by actual participation, at least as listeners-in in the family planning: how to make the wages cover the things the family has to have and the things they want; how to choose between needs and wants is part of the child's daily experience. But in an institution the shoes or necessities are provided because they are needed, the other things because they are nice to have. Unfortunately, most of the human race has to get along somehow without many of the things they really need, at least according to standard budgets. But they do get along. It is interesting to me that recent studies show that families in the lower income groups do actually spend for clothing, for example, a good deal less than the standard budget figures indicate as necessary. But in institutions we accustom children to having an adequate standard of living. Their needs are met from an impersonal source of supply, and it is to be expected that they will not know all at once how to choose wisely among their needs and desires when they are on their own. I know a boy who lived from the age of five to seventeen in a large institution. He was a model boy, and was graduated at the top of his high school class. He left the institution

for a fairly good job two years ago. He went to live with his sister and brother-in-law. He was always in debt; he never had shoes, or clothes, or carfare. Finally in disgust the sister arranged to take his pay check every week and pay his bills and provide him daily with pocket money and carfare. He likes it. At nineteen he feels better having someone else take care of him, though he is smart enough to hold a fair job even in depression times. Did the institution do that to the boy? I do not know, but I wonder.

The second group of problems that confront the child who has had a long period of institutional care face not only older but younger children as well—the task of becoming reacquainted with the families who have tended to become strangers to them during the separation. It seems to be important for people to come to terms with their families. I think we often find ourselves judging others by standards we have worked out through the intimate understanding and acceptance of our own kin. But children who know their parents only as occasional visitors over a period of years cannot be expected to see them as clearly as the child who lives intimately with them. It is only natural that the parents put on their best behavior for the short visits with their children. In an effort to protect the children from any feeling of inferiority about their parents' shortcomings, institution workers are apt to speak of parents only in kind and general terms. In fact, it would be very bad for them to do otherwise in most cases. The children naturally idealize their own people. Then when they leave the institution they must go through the painful process of first really getting acquainted with and then accepting, understanding if possible, and adjusting to their parents' shortcomings. I remember a family of Greek girls who spent twelve years in the Chicago Orphan Asylum and then returned to live with their devoted father. Their difficulties in accepting him as he really was, a man who ate dinner in his undershirt, who occasionally gave way to violent temper, who was not the best manager in the world, were quite tragic to observe and brought out clearly the fact that these children were unacquainted not only with their own father, but in a very fundamental way unacquainted with people. They had grown up with people in the quite controlled, conventional environment of an institution. They knew adults, for the most part, only when they were on duty and so presumably behaving in a disciplined and rather routine manner.

The third group of problems which face children upon their discharge from the institution are those

(Continued on page 6)

## CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA BULLETIN

### BULLETIN

Published monthly (omitted in July and August) as the official organ of the Child Welfare League of America.

C. C. CARSTENS, Editor

The Bulletin is in large measure a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

Annual subscription, \$1.00

Single copies, 10c.

Checks payable to Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

### Children's Protective Work in a Community's Programs

THE lack of systematic children's protective work is still a serious gap in the children's work of many cities and states.

The situation is particularly anomalous because so many different agencies are attempting to supply the need and usually without very much success. Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, Humane Societies, Juvenile Courts, Juvenile Protective Societies, Children's Aid Societies, State or County Children's Bureaus, Family Welfare Societies, Crime Prevention Bureaus and other organizations have in certain areas child protection as part or all of their programs. In some cities a number of these agencies are functioning at the same time with girls' protective work being done separately by still another agency.

Perhaps the term child protection is so inclusive that almost any agency dealing with children's problems may reasonably lay claim to having a part in the program. It is, therefore, necessary for the social workers in a given area to reach some consensus of opinion as to what is meant by children's protective work. This in our judgment is still woefully lacking.

For the purpose of attempting a restrictive definition, we would limit the use of the term to such service as requires an understanding of the general rules of evidence, of legal procedure and a practical use of the laws dealing with the protection of children when court action may be needed.

Many children's protective organizations, well equipped with trained staff, public or private, solve most of their complicated problems without recourse to court action and do it well because they know the possibilities and limitations in the use of the law.

Why not then leave the complicated problems that the unspecialized agencies cannot solve to the Juvenile Court? Because it so happens that in many areas where good juvenile court work is being done

some of the most complicated problems do not fall within the jurisdiction of juvenile courts. But even where they do, in many cases, some require more time, or skill, or both, than busy and sometimes over-worked probation officers can give to the cases. Besides such cases have a tendency to reach a court too late but might get to a non-court agency at a more helpable stage.

If then there is need for a non-court agency, must it be a private agency to undertake such service? Whether it should be a private or public agency depends on circumstances. For a large part of the nation, the solution will naturally wait upon the development of skilled public service. In cities, counties and states where private social work is well developed private children's protective agencies with skilled staff have done good work in the field. It would seem, therefore, wise for councils of social agencies to assess the values now available in their communities in specialized child protection and, if necessary, organize and simplify the program. At present a large part of the country is without skilled child protection and in great need of it. More anon.

—C. C. CARSTENS

### Adoption—A Challenge

IN A PAPER given by Miss Mary Ruth Colby of the United States Children's Bureau at the National Conference in Seattle, June, 1938, the following statement appears: "From figures available in a few states it has been estimated that 16,000 children are adopted in one year (in the United States)." In connection with that the following figures taken from the 1937 reports from member agencies of the Child Welfare League of America are definitely challenging. Ninety-five of the 168 member agencies report that they completed adoptions in the year. The total number of adoptions listed reaches 1484, or less than one-tenth of the estimated adoptions in the country. Member agencies of the Child Welfare League, of course, by no means comprise the full list of child-placing agencies in the country, but they do represent an important cross-section of good child placing work, and this small figure is, therefore, of great significance. Thirty-two members report that they did ten or more adoptions in a year. The highest number reported by any one agency was 355, then followed 84, 75, 60, 55 and so on down to a scattering of 1, 2 or 3. These figures once again clearly bring home the fact that by and large the adoption work going on in this country is not in the hands of the qualified agencies. Why is this so? Therein lies the challenge to children's agencies.

## The Wish is Father to the Need

MARGARET G. BOURNE

Consultant, Probate Court

County of Cuyahoga, Cleveland, Ohio

ONE of the most significant remarks in a recent article on adoptions was that social workers should consider the outside point of view as it *is*, not as we wish it to be. We are all aware that we social workers, in the majority of adoption cases, are on one side of the fence, and lined up on the other side are the doctor, the lawyer, the client, and all their cohorts! Now isn't this a ridiculous state of affairs? It is true nevertheless.

May I be personal? When I first took my position at the Probate Court ten years ago I felt puzzled. I had been brought up properly in a private case-work agency, and was proud of it. This was my first public position. When I attended committee meetings of case-working agencies I heard my court severely criticized for neglecting many issues. When I was at the court I heard the clerks criticize agencies in an equally severe manner.

One day there was a spirited contest in an adoption case. It became quite bitter. All of a sudden it flashed over me that they didn't understand each other's terms—legal, social, and common English! Sensing that, it didn't take very long to straighten out the case, and since then many others have been straightened out before they reached the courtroom. The simple English language is very necessary. The lack of the common use of it between doctor, lawyer, client and social workers is really a serious handicap.

It is hard for the public to separate our rules from our standards. They hear a great deal about both and become confused. Unfortunately, they remember all the little rules and forget the fine standard which that rule is supposed to be supporting. It is a curious freak of the human mind to be impressed with a little thing and to forget the ideal or larger implication. No, they shouldn't, but they do, and it is no use trying to pretend otherwise.

There is another curious point about human nature. When anything becomes too organized, people turn against it and go to the other extreme. Take the simple game of bridge. It has become very elaborate and strict. The result is that people have taken to all kinds of happy-go-lucky games. That psychology is all right for our bridge game, but not so good for our adoption cases. Even back in the "good old days," this was true. Look at the history of ancient

ballads in folklore. When the English language became too stilted and formal, all kinds of narrative songs sprang up. When we are working with human nature we must remember how human nature reacts, not how we wish it would react.

Another thing our clients fuss about is the fact that they feel placed in the position of being too severely judged and x-rayed, and altogether doing something wrong in applying to adopt a child. This attitude started me watching myself and everyone else as well. The clients all realize a study is necessary, so why do they protest? Taking the law of averages, most people's motives in adopting children are good. Here and there, the ulterior motives in adopting children are dreadful, but these fortunately are in the minority. I, for one, am convinced that we can interview our clients and accept them in a more friendly way. A careful investigation will bring out these ulterior motives from which we wish to protect the child. Our clients like to be considered as first-rate citizens and should be.

What about the doctors? Why are social workers and doctors at odds? These two professions should be working shoulder to shoulder. Are we? The profession of the physician is the older of the two. The physician is, therefore, due the courtesy of our consulting him first and asking for his friendship. Do we?

There is another group that always concerns me and that is the mother or parents who feel they must give up their child, and who then go about the placement in a very haphazard way. There are many reasons for this—fear, ignorance, timidity, defiance, and often misunderstanding.

In conclusion, it is easy to realize that a certain type of emotion underlies all this confusion surrounding the adoption of children. I do not know what the psychiatrist calls it, but I do know that it always appears in close-to-the-heart, personal relationships such as engagements and marriages. The adoption of children is just as close to people's hearts. This emotion does not wish to listen to reason. Logic is not in its pattern. The road of this emotion is long and hard. If we social workers are willing to recognize it as it is and have patience to understand it, perhaps it may develop into what we wish it to be.

## Problems Facing Children Who Have Had a Relatively Long Period of Institutional Care

*(Continued from page 3)*

concerned with making for themselves an adequate personal, social life. The problems of where to live and how to make arrangements for one's self, and how to find friends are real for all young people when they leave the family group, but with institutional children they are problems of peculiar difficulty. Not only has the institutional child been asked to make very few arrangements for himself, but in addition his life has been planned for him according to such artificial patterns that it is hard for him to find his way about in the community at large. Even his friends have probably been found for him by the constant enforced association with a large group in the institution. If he lost friendship of one, the group was always at hand for company. He is unfamiliar with many of the ordinary social usages in the community. Just such simple matters as being careful to keep appointments with your friends, being careful to arrange future recreation together, is often overlooked by institution children who are used to having their friendships managed for them by the cottage mother and by the general routine planning for the institution group. That this picture of a very insecure and frightened young person, unfamiliar with the give and take of friendship and unable to establish for himself an equal and interesting relationship with his peers, does not apply to all institutional children, I realize. However, there is admittedly enough truth in the picture to make us aware of the fact that institutional children present special difficulties in making social adjustments. Institutions that have broken down their traditional isolation and have made it possible for their children, through attendance at public schools, through taking part in normal community recreation, through utilization of the public library, and playing with other children on the playground, are making it much more possible for their children to learn how to behave socially, even though they spend years away from family life.

The last group of problems which I wish to mention is one about which we really know almost nothing, and about which we would most like to know what difficulties our institutional children encounter. Those are the problems connected with the making of a satisfactory marriage and the establishment of a new home. Do institutional children make good husbands or wives and good parents? One case worker, in discussing this problem with me, out of her

experience in supervising a large number of older girls and boys placed out from an institution in which they had a long and somewhat meager experience, said that she felt that her institution children, in looking for their future marriage partners, were always really looking for a substitute father or mother person, some one who would take care of them; that they were little inclined to the partnership arrangement in marriage. If they were fortunate enough to find a competent partner who could really assume a parental role, then the marriage, at least at that particular level, might be stable and a success. But if their marriage demanded of them the taking of much responsibility or the assumption of a general give and take relationship, these insecure young people who had never learned how to establish such a relationship were at a loss to make a success out of their marriage.

Institution children, at least those who have had a long period of institutional life, learn to protect themselves from caring too much for any one person. I remember the shock it was to me when I heard a friend of mine tell a group of institution children that she was about to leave the institution. She was herself deeply attached to the children in the institution and spoke with some feeling as she told them of her going, but their response was not at all what we had anticipated. In spite of the fact that they were apparently very fond of her they were completely casual about her going. "Oh, well, someone else will come to take your place." Perhaps in a changing world that is a healthful attitude to take but it does seem to indicate that the institution children make somewhat superficial contacts. Naturally since the adults in charge of them come and go frequently, the children cannot be expected to form deep and permanent attachments for anyone.

I admit that I have made a rather dark picture of what long periods of institutional care do to children. I have done so not because I am against institutions as such, but because it seems to me that we should analyze the fundamental experiences which we are giving these large groups of children for whom we are attempting to be substitute parents. Institution programs have improved in many ways. Some of the superficial difficulties which I have indicated have already been eliminated in some, even many, institutions, but I believe that there are basic factors inherent in the very situation of institutional care, no matter how good the institution is, which must be recognized if we are to control them. There are difficulties which continue to operate against the building of good character in children even in the most modern

## CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA BULLETIN

and well-equipped institutions when institutional care continues over an extended period. The first of these dangers is that of seriously over-protecting children from the results of their own mistakes. The very fact that cottage mothers are paid to be exceptionally understanding; selected to deal with children with great tolerance and acceptance, means that children are not subjected in the institution to the same natural reactions from people that they ordinarily arouse in the untrained, normal family group. It is undoubtedly true that for the child who is mentally sick it may be necessary to provide a peculiarly accepting environment for a time. But the normal child who is getting ready to live in the rough and tumble world as it is learns a good deal by taking life as it comes.

Institutions protect children from their own parents too, making it easy for children to overlook parents' faults and idealize their weaknesses. The parent who pays nothing for his child's board can still appear a marvelous provider because he buys an expensive bicycle at Christmastime. Is this a healthy attitude toward reality for a child to develop? The more modern, the more thoughtfully run the institution, the more apt it is to over-protect children from the unreasonableness, the cruelty and the inconsistencies of real life. The writer of a recent paper dealing with some of the difficulties which young people have in adjusting to other individuals in their work experiences—a personnel director in a large retail store—said: "Previous experiences have not prepared them to adapt to a wide variety of personalities. They expect people and situations to be reasonable and are unable to understand when they are not. They are not prepared for the multitude of circumstances which arise." By over-protecting their children, institutions develop young people who have difficulty in adjusting to others.

The second basic danger in institutional care is, I believe, the danger of over-entertaining children, at least of giving them too much attention, either favorable or unfavorable. The children in institutions are almost all the time everybody's job. They are the center of interest for the whole situation. In a family home there are adult interests equal to the children's in importance. But the more conscientious the institution staff, the more apt they are to supervise, to direct, however subtly, the lives of the children under their care. Whether the entertainment take the form of frequent movies, excellently directed recreational programs, or constant nagging; and even when the adults in the institution do conscientiously leave the children alone as much as possible, the situation of living in a large group where something is always hap-

pening, where one never needs to use one's initiative to escape the dreadful situation of being bored, tends to develop children who have no initiative but are completely dependent upon their environment for direction and satisfaction, and who expect a lot of attention.

The third fundamental weakness is one which institutions are almost helpless to change and one which, it seems to me, increases almost in proportion as the institution is improved—that is the tendency of the institutional situation to overwhelm children. The institution is so big to a child, the machinery, of necessity, so complicated, that the children must feel completely impotent most of the time; what difference does anything they or even their parents do or say make in the total smooth running of this huge machine? In good institutions the child cannot even be critical, for his equipment is perfect, from dining room to bedroom, play space and garden. The staff is strong and good and kind. When the cottage mother is sick or nervous or worn out, her place is taken by another calm, strong, relief matron. I cannot but believe that any child must be strongly tempted to sink back into a kind of infantile dependence when he is brought up in the presence of such an overwhelmingly adequate substitute parent. At some periods in his life a child may well need to be over-protected, to be very carefully watched and entertained and may need to feel the sustaining strength of just such a kind parent as a good institution can be. But a long period in such an environment certainly contrasts sharply with the reality that our children must live with when they leave us. Children who have had a long period of such care, who have grown up in such a situation, can be expected to have problems in adjustment.

### White House Conference

AT THE direction of President Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins, has issued invitations to approximately seventy individuals prominent in national life to serve as members of a planning committee for a national "Conference on Children in a Democracy." The President's hope is that "the activities of the conference will result in practical suggestions as to ways in which we may give greater security to childhood and a larger measure of opportunity to youth, and thus strengthen the foundations of our national life."

The first session of the conference will be held at the White House on April 26, 1939, and the final session will be held early in 1940.

## An Experiment in Interpretation to Young People

*(Continued from page 1)*

whose problems they know and understand helps them apply what they have learned in case conferences and they recognize personality assets which may be developed in future treatment. The auxiliary groups are self-governed, with a sponsor in the background to guide or advise if their enthusiasm takes them too far afield. A constitution for all the groups, set up with the general form of organization, keeps the purpose of service clear and minimizes the social element, even to limiting the refreshments. Each auxiliary girl is a member of Bluegate Cottage, for which she pays yearly dues of one dollar. The children give benefits and otherwise raise money for the Cottage or other purposes of the Association. Although these sources bring considerable income to the Association, they are not emphasized or particularly encouraged. The educational program is always kept in the forefront. Last spring, the "Children's Service to Children" held an annual meeting at one of the large clubs. Some three hundred enthusiastic girls and their sponsors planned and conducted the meeting. Parents sat at tables at the back and on the sides of the room. The President of each auxiliary group and Children's Service to Children group in a private school gave a report on what had been done in Service to Children during the year. The poise of these eager girls as they went up to the microphone and, with a fine growing understanding of real values, gave their reports, was a heartening sight and promises well for the future of social work under their direction. They are children from families prominent in the community not only for their wealth but also for their participation in community activities and their acceptance of civic responsibilities. These girls are the future members of the Junior League and the Boards of Directors of social agencies. Already those who have graduated are coming back to serve on committees and take their places, not only in the Association but on committees of the Council of Social Agencies. No detail and no explanation, we believe, is too insignificant to take the time of the best-trained worker on the staff, that this process of interpretation may proceed on a sound basis.

So our "Children's Service to Children" has been a channel through which groups of young people, cherished and protected and eager to help others, have come to understand the needs of less fortunate children who are maladjusted, insecure, and deprived of parental love or happy homes. They have participated in helping individual boys and girls and

through this understanding and helping are developing a growing interest in their community's service to children.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, in her newspaper column, "My Day," in discussing our "Children's Service to Children" said: "It seems to me this might be adapted to the needs of different communities. It may be a practical, sensible way of introducing youngsters to their community at an early age."

## Children's Aid Society of New York

A GENERAL expansion of all its Foster Home Services, to include the care of dependent and neglected children in Queens and Richmond as well as Manhattan and the Bronx, was announced today by Arthur Huck, Executive Director of the Children's Aid Society, New York City. In order to fully integrate this new work with the Society's present extensive Foster Home program, Miss Helen D. Cole has been advanced to the position of Supervisor of Foster Care Services.

"As a result of certain special gifts to the Society it is now possible," Mr. Huck stated, "to provide a wider, more comprehensive program which will integrate the Society's entire foster home services for both white and Negro children and extend this type of care to children in other boroughs, which has been planned for several years."

The Society's existing facilities for the care of Negro boys at Brace Farm and in foster homes have also been considerably extended by means of a special gift. This work at Brace Farm will be closely integrated under Miss Cole's supervision with the Negro Service Bureau. Brace Farm will be used as a reception and study home for all Negro boys placed by the Society. These combined services will receive dependent and neglected Negro children from both the Department of Public Welfare and the Children's Court.

"It is hoped that by accepting more children from the Court the flow of Negro children to the state institutions at Hudson and Warwick may be checked," Mr. Huck stated, "since many of them have gone to these institutions for no other reason than because there has been no other type of care available for them."

Miss Cole will continue to direct the regular Foster Home Placement of children in Manhattan and the Bronx, which will be slightly extended this year. The Housekeeper Service, taken over by the Society a year ago from the Junior League, and also under Miss Cole's direction, is of growing importance in the Society's services to families. Through additional gifts it will be possible to practically double the number of families under care during 1939.